

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. in the Office Action of January 21, 2010, claims 1-25 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 are amended.

#### **I. Objection To Claims**

Claim 17 was objected to for various informalities.

With this amendment, claim 17 is amended taking into consideration the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims and 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-2, 21-22 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Glazer* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,588,497).

Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glazer*.

Claims 3-6, 15-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(\*) as being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Ziada* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,465) ("*Ziada*").

Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Ziada* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,465) ("*Ziada*") and in further view of *Scher* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,282,837) ("*Scher*").

Claims 13-14, 18, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Scher*.

Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 24 and 25 recite a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting air in a form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other.

*Glazer* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting air in a form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other. Instead, *Glazer* merely discloses two diaphragms oscillating in time harmonic motion. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,588,497, Col. 11, l. 25-35. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing a plurality of ejecting sections adapted to eject air such that the vibration of a vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other because *Glazer* merely discloses a diaphragm oscillating in time harmonic motion without disclosing anything pertaining to the weakening of sound waves.

*Ziana*, similarly, fails to disclose a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting air in a form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other. Instead, *Ziana* discloses dampening the flow from a slot by producing an external compensatory oscillation using an external generator to counteract the oscillation generated by the flow from the slot. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,465, Col. 6, l. 39- 65. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting air in the form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other because *Ziana* merely discloses producing a compensatory oscillation from an external generator to dampen an oscillation caused by a flow opposed to adapting a plurality of ejecting sections to weaken the vibrations generated by a flow coming from the ejectors.

*Scher* similarly fails to disclose anything pertaining to a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting air in a form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting air in a form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other, heat is effectively dissipated from a heat sink without the generation of noise.

Therefore, because Glazer, Ziada and Scher fail to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claims 1, 24 and 25, the rejection of claims 1, 24 and 25 cannot stand. Because claims 2-23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 24 and 25, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2010

By:

/Timothy M Nitsch/  
Timothy M Nitsch  
Registration No. 58,019  
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000